

Appl. No. : 10/762,630
Filed : January 20, 2004

REMARKS

The May 20, 2005 Office Action was based upon pending Claims 1-21. This Amendment amends Claims 1-4, 6, and 9-11, cancels Claims 5 and 13-21 without prejudice or disclaimer, and adds new Claims 22-25. Thus, after entry of this Amendment, Claims 1-4, 6-12, and 22-25 are pending and presented for further consideration. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the pending claims as amended herein and as discussed below.

AMENDMENTS TO THE SPECIFICATION

Applicant has amended paragraph [0039] of the specification to include "As will be appreciated by those of skill in the art from the description and figures, the plastic housing 18 and outer casing of the screen structure 16 are molded." As one skilled in the art would recognize that the plastic housing and outer casing of the screen structure are molded, Applicant submits that no new matter is being introduced by way of this amendment.

CLAIM OBJECTIONS

The Examiner objected to Claims 1-4, 6, and 9-11 for minor informalities. In response, Applicant has amended Claims 1-4, 6, and 9-11 to correct the informalities without changing the scope of the claims. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the objection to the claims.

ALLOWABLE SUBJECT MATTER

Applicant thanks the Examiner for the indication of allowable subject matter in Claims 5 and 6. Pursuant to the Office Action, Applicant has amended Claim 1 to include the subject matter of Claim 5. Applicant has also amended Claim 6 to depend from Claim 1. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that Claims 1-4 and 6-12 are now in condition for allowance.

REJECTION OF CLAIMS 1-4 AND 17-21 UNDER 35 U.S.C. 102(b)

The Examiner rejected Claims 1-4 and 17-21 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,507,556 to Dixon. Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection as set forth below.

Appl. No. : 10/762,630
Filed : January 20, 2004

Regarding Claims 1-4, as discussed above, Applicant has amended Claim 1 herein to include subject matter from Claim 5 that the Examiner indicated to be allowable. Therefore, Applicant respectfully submits that Claim 1, as amended, is allowable. Applicant also submits that Claims 2-4 are each allowable, among other reasons, as depending from Claim 1.

Applicant has canceled Claims 17-21 herein without prejudice or disclaimer, mooted the rejection of these claims.

REJECTION OF CLAIMS 7-16 UNDER 35 U.S.C. 103(a)

The Examiner rejected Claims 7-16 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Dixon in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,059,255 to Rosen et al. Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection as set forth below.

Regarding Claims 7-12, as discussed above, Applicant has amended Claim 1 herein to include subject matter from Claim 5 that the Examiner indicated to be allowable. Therefore, Applicant respectfully submits that Claim 1, as amended, is allowable. Applicant also submits that Claims 7-12 are each allowable, among other reasons, as depending from Claim 1.

Applicant has canceled Claims 13-16 herein without prejudice or disclaimer, mooted the rejection of these claims.

NEW CLAIMS

As discussed above, as a result of the interview between the Examiner and Applicant's undersigned attorney, Applicant has amended original Claim 1 herein as new Claim 22. The Examiner indicated, pending further search of the prior art, that the proposed amendments would appear to overcome the references cited by the Examiner and the patents submitted in the Information Disclosure Statements. Applicant respectfully submits that new Claims 22-25 are patentable and requests early notification thereof.

New Claim 22 states, among other things, "a second removable fastening member configured to be advanced through the aperture and to be coupled with the headrest to secure the video monitor thereto" and "that when the screen structure is pivoted outward from the housing, access is provided to the second fastener, wherein

Appl. No. : 10/762,630
Filed : January 20, 2004

the second fastener is hidden from view during normal usage of the video monitor”
Thus, after installation, for example, the screen structure can be advantageously pivoted to provide access to the second fastener so that the video monitor can be removed from the headrest. After installation and during normal usage of the video monitor, the screen structure can be pivoted to a position that allows a passenger seated within the vehicle to view the viewing screen without viewing the second fastener. The foregoing example is provided for illustrative purposes only and is not intended to limit the claims.

The amendment has been slightly modified from the claim discussed with the Examiner. Specifically, for clarity, it recites that the “second fastener” is hidden from view during normal usage rather than “aperture”, since in use the second fastener would likely cover the aperture.

CONCLUSION

Claims 1-4, 6-12, and 22-25 are believed to be in condition for allowance, and an early notification thereof is respectfully solicited. Should the Examiner determine that additional issues may be resolved by a telephone call, the Examiner is cordially invited to contact the undersigned so that such issues may be promptly resolved and the case passed to issuance.

Please charge any additional fees, including any fees for additional extension of time, or credit overpayment to Deposit Account No. 11-1410.

Respectfully submitted,

KNOBBE, MARTENS, OLSON & BEAR, LLP

Dated: September 20, 2005

By: 

Edward A. Schlatter
Registration No. 32,297
Attorney of Record
Customer No. 20,995
(949) 760-0404

1756779_2/092005

Appl. No. : 10/762,630
Filed : January 20, 2004

SUMMARY OF INTERVIEW

Exhibits and/or Demonstrations

None

Identification of Claims Discussed

Claim 1

Identification of Prior Art Discussed

U.S. Patent No. 5,507,556 to Dixon, U.S. Patent No. 6,059,255 to Rosen et al., and Japanese Publication No. 2001-047921 to Shinji.

Proposed Amendments

Amendments to Claim 1 were proposed as reflected above in new Claim 22 in the listing of claims.

Principle Arguments and Other Matters

Applicant thanks the Examiner for the interview with Applicant's undersigned attorney on September 19, 2005. During the interview, Claim 1, the applied patents and Japanese Publication No. 2001-047921 to Shinji were discussed. The other patents listed in the Information Disclosure Statements were also briefly reviewed. In addition, it was proposed to amend Claim 1 substantially as set forth above in new Claim 22 of the listing of claims. The Examiner indicated, pending further search of the prior art, that the proposed amendments would appear to overcome the references cited by the Examiner and the patents submitted in the Information Disclosure Statements.

Results of Interview

As a result of the interview, Applicant has added new claims 22-25.